



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Ryan Orlando,
Stockton University

CSC Docket No. 2024-355

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
OF THE CHAIR/
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

Classification Appeal

ISSUED: January 16, 2024 (SLK)

Ryan Orlando appeals the determination of Stockton University (the University)¹ that the proper classification of his position with the University is Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services. The appellant seeks a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services.

The record in the present matter establishes that the appellant's permanent title is Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services. The appellant sought reclassification of his position, alleging that his duties were more closely aligned with the duties of a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services. The appellant reports to Bernadette Morris², Interim University Registrar and Executive Director of Students Records, Office of the Registrar. In support of his request, the appellant submitted a Position Classification Questionnaire (PCQ) detailing the duties that he performed as a Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services. The University reviewed and analyzed the PCQ and all information and documentation submitted. It also interviewed the appellant and Morris. In its decision, the University determined that the duties performed by the

¹ Pursuant to a Delegation Order, Memorandum of Understanding (Delegation Order), signed May 25, 2023, the parties agreed that the University would initially review the position reclassification requests of its employees, and then the determinations would be referred to the Civil Service Commission (Commission) for final determination.

² Morris' name could not be located in personnel records.

appellant were consistent with the definition and examples of work included in the job specification for Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services.

On appeal, the appellant states that the determination did not consider the context of the discussion that took place during his interview. He presents that the determination was based on a perceived lack of work involving “implementing policy and procedures.” However, he contends that his PCQ and interview should have made it clear that much of his job duties are autonomous and involve implementing and interpreting policies and procedures on a regular basis. The appellant asserts that his recommendations have steered paradigm shifts in how University standard operating procedures are developed and maintained. He highlights that his PCQ reflects that his most difficult job duties are transcript evaluation for awarding credit totals and articulating accepted transfer credits. The appellant indicates that the University has an incredibly complex curriculum. He contends that knowing how to incorporate outside transfer courses in specific University programs while following New Jersey transfer State-wide articulation agreements is like being fluent in a second language that few others understand. The appellant explains that his oversight is necessary when delegating assignments, such as data entry, to fellow staff and student workers. He states that he has coordinated several training sessions, particularly as the University transitions into newer software programs so that staff can use best practices. The appellant provides that he regularly serves on multiple committees, including the University Staff Senate as a Senator for Academic Affairs, with representatives from various offices on campus to assess current and proposed University policies and procedures.

The appellant notes that the determination indicated that another reason that his request was denied was because he lacked two years of the required experience as indicated in the job specification for Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services at the time of the request. However, he presents that he has almost two years of experience and he possesses a Master’s degree, and the job specification for the Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services title provides that a Master’s degree can be substituted for one year of experience. Further, the appellant provides that he has more than five years of experience in higher education administrative services.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:3-3.9(e) states that in classification appeals, the appellant shall provide copies of all materials submitted, the determination received from the lower level, statements as to which portions of the determination are being disputed, and the basis for appeal. Information and/or argument which was not presented at the prior level of appeal shall not be considered.

The definition section of the Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services (P18) job specification states:

Under the coordination of a Professional Services Specialist 2 or higher supervisory officer in the Administrative Services area at a State college, is responsible for performing basic professional functions using established policies, procedures, precedents, and guidelines; does related work as required.

The definition section of the Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services (P21) job specification states:

Under the direction of a Professional Services Specialist 2 or higher supervisory officer in the Administrative Services area at a State college, is responsible for independently performing professional work of greater difficulty using established policies, procedures, precedents, and guidelines; does related work as required.

In this present matter, a review of the job specifications indicates that the main differentiation between the two titles is the level of work. Specifically, a Professional Services Specialist 4, Administrative Services performs basic professional functions while a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services independently performs professional work of greater difficulty. A review of the appellant's PCQ indicates that his three main duties are performing transfer course articulations for incoming students following institutional and curriculum policies (20 percent), producing an initial evaluation of transfers credits, including Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and College Level Examination, for newly admitted transfer students based on current University policies and procedures (20 percent), and maintaining and updating the course articulation database for all incoming transfer courses (10 percent). While these tasks may have some technical complexity to them, they are still considered basic professional functions and they do not rise to the level of professional work of greater difficulty. For illustrative purposes from the Examples of Work from the Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services job specification, monitoring the fiscal affairs of the area and providing information for inclusion in the budget would be an example of a primary duty that would rise to the level of a Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services. However, the appellant's primary duties are clearly not at that level.

Regarding the appellant's comments about his education and experience, it is noted that the subject matter is a review of the appellant's duties to determine if his position is properly classified based on the primary duties that the appellant was performing at the time of the review. The appellant's experience and education have no bearing on this determination as the subject matter is not a determination as to whether the appellant meets the eligibility requirements for an examination for


Professional Services Specialist 3, Administrative Services. In this regard, the University is advised not to consider the qualifications of the individual requesting a classification review in the future as such information is not relevant to the proper classification of a position.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
THE 11TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2023



Allison Chris Myers
Chair/Chief Executive Officer
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Nicholas F. Angiulo
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P.O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Ryan Orlando
Mamta Patel
Division of Agency Services
Records Center